

REPORT
OF
PROFESSOR DRAPER
ON THE
INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF DEAF MUTES
AT
PARIS.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1890.

REPORT
OF
PROFESSOR DRAPER
ON THE
INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF DEAF MUTES
AT
PARIS.



WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1890.

REPORT OF PROFESSOR DRAPER ON THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF DEAF-MUTES AT PARIS.

Dr. E. M. GALLAUDET,

President of the National Deaf-Mute College:

SIR: I have the honor to make the following report as the representative of the college at the international meeting of the deaf held at Paris in July last.

The American delegation to the meeting was twenty-two in number, all but three of whom sailed together. The delegation was highly representative, (1) of the college, of whose graduates there were eight; partial coursemen, two; undergraduate, one, and honorary alumnus, one; (2) of localities and institutions, the Pennsylvania, the Illinois, the Ohio, the Connecticut, the California, the school and the institution in Indiana, and the two institutions in New York City being directly represented; several of the Southern States combined and sent a delegate, as also did the New England States and associations of the deaf in New Jersey and in Missouri; (3) of classes of the deaf, there being deaf and semi-deaf, mute and semi-mute; (4) of systems of instruction, there being graduates of the pure oral and of every shade of the combined system schools.

Upon the first day of the voyage the delegates assembled and organized. Of this organization I was chosen chairman. It met almost daily during the voyage, and upon two occasions in Paris. It appointed committees to systematize its work, and held general discussions as to the best methods of contributing to the value of the meeting and of making the American part therein effective.

Mr. F. Maginn, of Ireland, a student of our college (1884-'87), with several deaf friends met the delegation at Liverpool and brought two invitations; one being from Dean Bradley, of Westminster Abbey, to attend a lecture to be delivered by himself the same afternoon. Arrived in London, the delegation was met by Dr. Buxton, an English honorary alumnus of the college, who, with Dr. Thomas Gallaudet, of New York, interpreted the dean's lecture. This was upon the history of the abbey, and was given in the Jerusalem Chamber, the speaker being often able to illustrate his remarks by referring to the walls of that ancient room. After the lecture the dean led the delegation through parts of the abbey not usually shown to visitors. This would have been an honor even if it had been done perfunctorily, but the dean performed it with such evident pleasure that the delegation was moved by his kindness scarcely less than by the venerable pile that surrounded them.

The second invitation was to attend a reception by the deaf people of London at St. Savior's Church, in Oxford street, the same evening. Tea was provided in an ante-room, from which we entered a chapel devoted to missionary work among the deaf. The room is of moderate size, but well adapted to its purpose. On the walls are paintings of scriptural scenes by Mr. Davidson, a mute who was present at the meeting. There

were assembled about one hundred deaf persons, mostly artisans and tradesmen, with a sprinkling of artists. The meeting was conducted by Mr. Bathers, a draughtsman in the admiralty; it was enthusiastic, orderly, attentive, and well managed in every respect. Many brief addresses were made by speakers from both nations. The Englishmen nearly all praised the American system of educating the deaf as, in their judgment, the best known; they also spoke of the single-hand alphabet as superior to the double-hand used by themselves. Being invited to speak, I said:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND FRIENDS: When our ship reached Liverpool this morning and from her deck were seen several of your number conversing in the crowd that stood upon those wonderful docks, it recalled that line of your greatest poet which says "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin;" for though you dwell here upon an island and we upon a continent beyond the seas, yet in all essentials our experiences are probably the same. If you have troubles we can sympathize with you, for we have the same troubles; or if you have joys, those joys are ours, and we rejoice with you.

There must, however, be some points of difference. Several of your speakers have dwelt with generosity on the superiority of the single-hand alphabet, and your chairman has humorously described its advantages in courtship. Now, my experience covers that happy period; it goes farther—into paternity; and there the single-hand alphabet is sometimes the only means of communication that will meet the case; for example, when my boy is unruly I can catch him and hold him with one hand while preaching a reformation to him with the other; but if your boy misbehaves, when you have caught him you must let go and preach with both hands—and where, then, will your boy be?

Your speakers have also kindly mentioned the free and universal education offered to the deaf in America. That praise is just; as an illustration, let me say that the State of Montana has but recently been organized; it has no school for the deaf, but, far from allowing its deaf children to grow up uneducated, it has sent a number of them to the school at Washington, more than 2,000 miles, paid for their tuition and paid for their safe conduct home. This is mentioned only to express the hope that the same fair and enlightened treatment of the deaf will soon be as common in your own land as it is in ours.

You have convinced me that there is an antithesis between England and her people—England is small, while the English heart is large; but I acknowledge no such contrast with regard to America—America is large and her heart is large, too; of this we shall hope to convince you when you come to see us.

Unusual detentions in crossing the Channel and at the customs in Paris prevented me from being present at the opening of the congress. At this first session, however, nothing was done save to effect an organization, which was accomplished by the choice of M. Dusuzeau, one of the leading French promoters of the meeting, as president, who named MM. LaCroix and Navarre as secretaries, and of a vice-president from each country represented, the one from America being Mr. Douglas Tilden, formerly a teacher in the California institution, but now pursuing the study of sculpture in Paris. Mr. Tilden's urbanity, and his knowledge of French signs and customs, proved upon many occasions of the greatest assistance to the American delegation.

On the following evening the first exercises took place. About one hundred and sixty were present, all but a few being delegates. They represented the following countries, which are named in the order of number of delegates: France, the United States, Belgium, England (including Ireland and Scotland); Austria, Germany, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and Holland. The absence of ladies in the audience, and the fact that the sessions were always under police surveillance, were to the Americans marked and not at all agreeable features. At the last session as I, in evening dress, approached the door, a *gendarme* halted me; I explained by gestures, but he would not permit me to enter until some one whom he knew came to my assistance.

As this session was typical of those which followed, although by the

earnestness of the Americans the conditions were somewhat improved towards the end of the meeting, it may be described here. The scene presented was extraordinary to us, accustomed as we were to the quiet, order, attention, and progress of assemblages conducted upon "town-meeting" principles, and fresh from the excellent example of the same in the convention at Kendall Green; for the occasion before us seemed to be characterized by a lack of these features. There was much confusion. At the same time that a speaker was endeavoring to impress his ideas upon the audience, the audience itself, and even the officers upon the platform, would be plunged in animated discussions, as if the assembly were a *soirée* rather than a deliberative body. Members were often compelled to get the floor as best they could, a condition so repugnant that some of the best and ablest men in the British delegation never addressed the congress at all. The management was practically unacquainted with the history of education for the deaf in America, nor did it know anything of the persons, deaf or hearing, who have been, or are, prominent in connection with the deaf in that part of the world. Moreover, the French seemed to have had no experience in the processes of legislation. Imagine, for example, our astonishment when, one of our number having introduced a resolution, after considerable awkwardness we learned that the management had no conception of the acts of proposing, seconding, debating, and passing upon a resolution.

A snap judgment would doubtless ascribe all this to inferiority upon the part of the French, but a little reflection showed that part was due to the national self-content, and the rest was simply a characteristic of French meetings in general—known to every one familiar with the proceedings of the *Corps Législatif*. What better could be expected of a nation whose school-boys are always under strict surveillance and not allowed to hold meetings for any purpose?

Badly as this promised for business, it was intensified by the inadequate arrangements as to time, the sessions lasting only from 8 to 10 p. m. It was, moreover, usually much past 8 before the president called the assembly to order. The police promptly cleared the hall at 10, except upon the last two evenings, when the time was extended at first to 10.30 and then to 11. Under these circumstances deliberation was not possible. No proper discussion of papers could be held. The papers themselves, often prepared with care and needing ten or fifteen minutes for clear delivery, had to be hastily sketched in two or three minutes, for every one was eager to offer his paper or to comment on those already offered, as was his due.

When it became apparent that such was to be the character of the meeting, great discontent arose, especially among the British and American delegations. These went so far as to seriously discuss the advisability of withdrawing, organizing at some other point, and by holding day sessions under better management endeavor to make the meeting all that they believed it could and should become. While sympathizing with this feeling, I, with others, was opposed to such action; the French, we thought, were doing the best they knew how; the occasion was chiefly theirs; we should, therefore, help them out by improving the meeting in every way that was open to us, do our own part as well as we could under the circumstances, and be content with a kind but plain statement of the facts upon our return. This course was followed. Every member of the American delegation strove to systematize the work and raise the tone of the sessions, and this made itself felt towards the end.

There had been two occasions upon which I wished to address the meeting, but as the floor was not obtainable without great insistence, it happened that my only opportunity to speak occurred at the last session. I then delivered the following address:

THE FUTURE OF THE COLLEGE FOR THE DEAF IN AMERICA.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN: It falls to me to speak of what may be regarded as a culminating point in the educational movement begun by De l'Épée. By general consent such a place seems to belong to the college for the deaf at the capital city of the United States.

A quarter of a century has passed since that institution was founded. Its brief history is known to the world; the sum of its results can be estimated. Its representative need not pause to recall that history, nor to utter a panegyric upon those results; and yet, acquainted with the vicissitudes of that history, knowing each man in every college generation, its representative would obey the dictates neither of his heart nor of his judgment did he not stand here to claim, with all modesty, that that history has been glorious, and those results, all things considered, an almost unqualified success. For proof he can point to the intelligence and character of the graduates; to the positions they have won in literary, scientific, and educational circles; to the social honor and confidence which they possess in the community; to the elevating and impelling though indirect force the college has exerted among hundreds of the deaf, who, nevertheless, have not been able to enroll themselves among its alumni.

But, gentlemen, if perchance all these evidences should not avail—if the world, hearing the history of the college and viewing its results, should with cold averted eyes pronounce it a failure, would that settle the question? No; there would yet remain the confident appeal to the hearts of the graduates themselves. The secret consciousness of each one of them, dwelling upon his life history, must assure him that but for the breadth of development secured at the college his mental powers would have remained comparatively unaroused, his field of action forever circumscribed, his social, artistic, and spiritual aspirations keyed to lower flights.

So much may be said of what is past in the history of the college; its friends and alumni cherish the unshaken confidence that it has been a great, a powerful, and an ennobling factor in the history of our class.

Look, now, for a moment, at its present. Its advantages are many. If not endowed, it is richly dowered. It has ample and beautiful premises. Its buildings are commodious and handsome. It is placed at the political capital of the nation, a city which is rapidly becoming also the social, literary, and scientific center of America. It enjoys the support of an enlightened public sentiment. Its directors and faculty are imbued with the love of duty—with the wish and the will to cling to no beaten path should a wider and better expand before them. Finally, gentlemen—and this counts for much, since it is often not men but *a man* who leads to destiny—the college has at its head one of whom it is not too much to say that he embodies as commanding abilities, as enthusiastic forces as ever were enlisted in the cause of the deaf.

The main theme of this address is now to be presented. We are concerned less with the past and present than with the coming time. If the history of the college has been glorious and successful, if its present is full of advantages and promise, what is to be its future? Let us draw no hasty inferences. Should the college methods and aims remain just the same in the future as in the past, it does not follow that the results will be correspondingly successful. The world changes, and it never changed so rapidly and so radically as to-day; nor is this change less marked in educational than in other affairs?

Now, the college for the deaf has been from its inception an almost purely literary institution. Except in the English, French and German languages, in drawing and in mathematics, its curricula have hardly touched the domain of practical life; latterly an improved chemical laboratory has been added and is doing an excellent and increasing work.

Several considerations have in recent years led to the thought that *perhaps* this approach of the college methods and aims to the demands of practical affairs ought to be more general and close. Conversation, correspondence, and at least two articles in our leading journal have tended to arouse reflection upon the subject. Moreover, observation discloses the fact that other institutions of learning are everywhere yielding to the demand. They specialize and diversify their courses with numberless options. Universally they seem inclined to accept the dictum of Herbert Spencer that a youth should study as a youth that which he will practice as a man—a theory very far removed from that once quoted in an address to the students by the lamented

Garfield—that it “was not necessary to know Latin, but it was necessary to have forgotten it.”

Now, if this tendency of modern education is sound in regard to the hearing, is it not trebly so with regard to the deaf? Almost without exception the students of the college are poor; they have not only reputation but subsistence to conquer. Not all, even of those highly qualified in every way, are able to secure the precious opportunity of an entrance into professional life. Moreover, a large percentage have not been able to sustain the full requirements of the college course, yet in this contingent are many who in courses involving the use of hands and eyes might have ranked among the foremost.

To be brief then, as here needs must, should the college in the future, while retaining as much as possible of college spirit and aims, teach less of language, literature, and philosophy, and more, for example, of some such acquirements as practical surveying, chemistry, drawing, designing, modeling, carving, engraving, architecture, practical astronomy, and so on?

If this were done, there seems little doubt that the alumni generally could at graduation step at once into honorable and lucrative employments, instead of being compelled, as in most cases at present and in more, perhaps, in the future, to find or create spheres of activity after they leave the college.

Gentlemen, this is an alluring view. Yet, let us not hastily champion it. Neither let us antagonize it, though it ought to be said at once that against its too thorough adoption there certainly exists one great, if not vital objection. The college for the deaf was founded as a *college*. Its promoters aspired to prove to the world that many among our ranks were capable of attaining the highest intellectual culture, and of conferring upon the world results corresponding thereto. Such changes as have been suggested, if carried too far, would amount to a practical abandonment of this aspiration. The college would be no longer a college. It would be, at best, a college of industrial art, or a college with some other addendum which would render it *not* a college.

Is it possible to consider a step so far backward at the call of utility, or at any other call whatsoever? If, after twenty-five years of faithful endeavor, the attempt to carry the education of the deaf to a high point should be abandoned as impracticable, when would it be revived? Or, must it perish forever? If the free, enthusiastic, and generous American people can not establish and maintain it, where on the earth shall we look for a people who will dare even to renew the attempt?

Gentlemen, we can not know whether utilitarian or scholastic theories will prevail in the future administration of the college. It is a question that is certain to arise. Its discussion can do no harm and may do much good.

However it may be decided, let us cherish the serene confidence that no changes will be made so sweeping as to destroy the college germ. An institution that has even in a few brief years made its power and beneficence felt not only throughout the borders of the land that created it, but in nations beyond the seas; such an institution can not, must not, be let die in that which especially distinguishes it. Man will defend it. God will preserve it. It must contain the seeds not only of life, but of adaptive and expanding usefulness.

Finally, gentlemen, let us never lose sight of the fact that if we would see such a consummation 'tis we ourselves must win it. The munificence of governments can do much; the love and the sympathy of De l'Épées and Gallaudets can do more; but neither, nor all, can conquer the world for us. That is ours to do. The achievements we grasp, the characters we form—these alone are effective. Let us labor to make the one so high, the other so fine and true, that at last the world will be forced to turn and cry, Behold the education of the deaf—even a college for the deaf—is not a boon conferred; it is an investment. The toil, the time, the treasure, are not spent; they return upon us in compensations sure and sweet.

This paper was prepared in the hope that a discussion of it by so many intelligent deaf men would lead to valuable results; but since under the management no proper discussions could be held, the paper failed of its purpose.

The delegations foreign to France had looked to the meeting chiefly as an opportunity to convince the public of the progress made by the deaf, and to accomplish all that they could for the future advancement of the class, while they did not overlook the fact that it was also to celebrate the centenary of De l'Épée. With the French, however, this latter object seemed paramount. Every session abounded with apostrophes to his memory, and two day sessions were set apart to honor

the same—as much time, in the aggregate, as was devoted to all other subjects together.

Upon the first of these days the congress assembled at Versailles. This city of his birth has duly honored De l'Épée. The street leading to the site of his birthplace bears his name, his portrait hangs in the city hall, and his effigy in bronze adorns one of the public squares. The building in which he was born has been replaced by others, and these are inclosed by a high wall of stone, upon which was now unveiled a brass plate bearing an appropriate inscription. The president of the congress and a representative of the mayor made brief addresses. The company then proceeded to the statue, where the chief exercises of the day were held. The Americans had by subscription provided a large and handsome basket of flowers, which they placed at the base of the statue before the ceremonies began; some of the European delegations, according to their custom, brought tributes in the form of parti-colored beads, arranged in imitations, more or less bizarre, of natural flowers. When his turn came the representative of the American delegation, Mr. W. L. Hill, of Athol, Mass., delivered an earnest and spirited address from the steps of the monument. The exercises of this day were orderly, appropriate, and complete. After them the company proceeded to the palace of Louis XIV., and were photographed in the famous gardens of the palace, having for a background the "Glass Gallery" in which the Prussians proclaimed William I. Emperor of Germany.

The second of the days devoted to De l'Épée opened with memorial services in the ancient church of St. Roch, in the Rue St. Honore, Paris. The remains of De l'Épée lie beneath a handsome tomb on the left of the entrance. The exercises were entirely by priests. Not far from the church, in the Rue Therese, and near the avenue de l'Opera, is the site of the house where De l'Épée died in the midst of his pupils. A large brass plate had been placed high up on the wall of the present building, and was now uncovered; no exercises were held. The plate records the dates of his birth and death, his achievements, and an encomium pronounced upon him by the French legislature.

The foreign delegations had felt that the French were not at home in the management of public meetings, but happily there was one occasion at which the latter were in their element. They arranged a banquet for one of the closing evenings, and in this social field they fairly shone. All the details were exquisitely attended to. Every little point of etiquette was foreseen. Moreover, the affair took place in a building on the Rivoli which was said to have been once a palace. The apartments certainly, in loftiness and breadth, in the taste and beauty of their decorations, in the splendor of all their appointments, compared favorably with the grandest that we had seen in the palaces of Paris and Versailles. A senator (Hugot) of France presided, and when the company were seated at the broad and brilliantly-adorned table it seemed as if no body of managers could have done their part more delicately and well. The banquet was prolonged for five hours. Towards its close many speeches were made from a table near the center of the hall, at the side of which stood a bust of De l'Épée. This, as the speaking went on, became fairly buried in the flowers cast upon it by speakers and spectators. Many of the speeches were inimitable.

A brief *soirée d'adieu* on the next evening closed the congress. Were this the proper place I should be glad to go into details of the many excellent parts borne by my colleagues. Their papers, as a whole, touched upon every question that most concerns the deaf, whether at

school, at work, or in society. From the many impressions which the meeting left with me several are prominent:

(1) In the direction of artistic culture the deaf have made greater advances in other lands than in our own. In each of the foreign delegations I found one or more who excelled in the use of the pencil, brush, or burin. This is but natural, since they live in communities where these pursuits are generally cultivated; yet it is a field which might be better tilled in our own schools for the deaf.

(2) The general public in France took no interest in this meeting. There were no hearing persons at the sessions except a few teaching priests. It is true that a senator presided at the opening session and at the banquet, but he said little, and did nothing except to beam his good-will. Remembering the many evidences of public interest in the recent meeting at Kendall Green—the large proportion of hearing persons in the audience, the “pestilent pursuit” after news of the meeting by reporters, the admirable reports of the meeting in all the daily papers of Washington—then, indeed, the contrast here was significant.

(3) The chief practical results of the meeting with regard to the American delegation were the breadth, experience, and incitement accruing to its members by means of travel, society, and debate; and the impression which they created, not only upon the deaf of other lands, but upon numbers of hearing people, during the voyage out and at other times. With regard to the first point the results would have been increased if the arrangements on the part of the French had been such as to permit of the dispatch of business. With regard to the second point, which could be illustrated by many incidents, I am sure the impressions given by the delegation were such as will lead many persons to look with different eyes upon such deaf persons as they may hereafter meet, and to hold in greater respect that system of education and that national spirit which have produced the genial, sociable, and intelligent traveling companions that the delegates proved themselves to be.

(4) The Americans as a body were plainly the leading delegation in the congress. They displayed a brightness, an earnestness, a resource, a fertility of illustration, a fullness of information, a readiness in speaking, and a clearness in delivery that was found, at best, but scattering among the other delegations. But while taking this view no disparagement to the other delegations is intended. The precedence is not ascribed to any native superiority on the part of the Americans, nor even to the better educational advantages they have enjoyed; it arose, doubtless, chiefly from the wider, freer, more equable social and political atmosphere in which as Americans it has been their happy lot to be reared. All this is a difference of circumstances merely, and therefore it is hoped that the statement of my view will give no offense.

(5) The sign language has attained a range and finish in America that is unknown in other countries. In England among the best educated the means of intercourse is a very rapid use of the double-hand alphabet. This serves well for conversational purposes, but before an audience it is lifeless and ineffective. Among the less educated signs are used, but they are limited in range and lacking in expression. On the continent signs are much more generally used. They are, however, of a halting, broken, indistinct character, as if the speaker were obliged at every step not only to search his mind for an idea, but also for a means of expressing it. Among the Europeans in two cases only was there a delivery approaching that which can be seen everywhere in America—a delivery in signs that are smooth, clear, and cogent; that can win to smiles, affect to tears, provoke to reason, stir to emulation; a delivery,

in short, that is lacking in no essential of oratory. The possession of such a language seemed at once a cause and a consequence of the high average and comparative development of the Americans.

The American delegation had not been long in Paris before learning in various ways that there were not a few other societies of the deaf in the city besides the one which had issued the call for the meeting. Many of the delegation had enjoyed the hospitality of a leader in one of these societies, M. Griolet. He appeared to be the most intelligent deaf person whom we met abroad. He was now well past middle life, possessed a fine library, had traveled much, was devoted to numismatics, and was thoroughly well informed upon most subjects. Royalist in principle, he yet respected the republic, and indeed all his views of French politics and the French people seemed to me striking and just. One evening after the congress had finally ended a majority of the American delegation attended a meeting of his society. This meeting proved highly typical of French life and customs. It was held in the most public room of a café in the Rue Druot. We were told that their regular meeting place was in a room above, then undergoing repairs. The company, about forty, sat around the usual little tables of the café, smoking, chatting, playing various games, sipping beverages, and in general enjoying themselves in a highly independent and sociable manner. There were no indications of any higher purposes of the meeting except that near its end many representatives of both nations mounted a chair and made short speeches. The room was on a corner in a populous quarter, but the public seemed well accustomed to the scene. There was no obtrusive staring; if a frequenter of the café came along he would pass on to the side entrance. Most of the members were artisans, but there was a liberal sprinkling of artists, and some of their work in sculpture, judged by photographs, was excellent. One young man who had displayed talent was supported in part by the city while prosecuting his studies. This society was composed of Protestants. Our visit to it, coupled with the fact that we occasionally met upon the streets and saw upon the purely social occasion of the banquet numbers of deaf persons of evident character and talent who yet had not been present at the congress, led to the impression that perhaps we had seen in the congress only one *cercle*, instead of a gathering truly representing the deaf of the French capital.

One forenoon was spent at the Paris institution. The director, M. Javal, was very kind and polite. This school has been conducted upon the pure oral system since 1880. Of the fact there was ample proof, for, with the exception of some specimens of wood carving and pen and ink sketching, one saw little evidence of any intellectual culture whatever, except in the single direction of articulation and lip-reading. In these the results, as far as I could judge, were no better than those constantly obtained at Kendall Green. In the absence of any encouragement I endeavored, as far as politeness would allow, to test the acquirements of pupils in other directions. It would have been especially interesting to meet the best pupils, so as to compare them with those who yearly enter the introductory class of the college, but no classes or individuals were seen that had gone beyond the simplest expressions in language and numbers.

From Paris I proceeded alone to Brussels, in order to deliver to Monseigneur De Haerne the diploma awarded him at our last college commencement. Having previously written him of my inten-

tion, he had replied expressing the greatest interest and pleasure, and stating that a "solemn ceremony" would be held in honor of the occasion at the school for deaf girls in the Rue Rempart des Moines. My grief, therefore, was great when upon my arrival in Brussels I learned by a letter from M. Cotnam, the present director, that De Haerne was seriously ill. His mind is perfectly clear, but his eighty-five years press heavily upon him, and at times plunge him into periods of prostration, one of which unfortunately had begun within the two days previous.

M. Cotnam, however, wrote that this misfortune need not prevent me from giving, and he hoped from receiving the pleasure of a visit to the school. The day spent at this school proved one of the most interesting and profitable of all the days of my mission. It is for the blind as well as for the deaf. It is conducted entirely by Sisters of Charity. In the first room entered were about a dozen girls who were the children of "noble" people. This, by the way, was a distinction that a deaf Englishman had spoken of as a matter of course in a school that he had attended. While my reading had prepared me for it, nevertheless it struck oddly upon American nerves. This room joined a larger, in which the main body of the girls were assembled. All were quite young, the oldest apparently not yet seventeen. Their education, while essentially oral, had not involved the rigid prohibition of signs. It seemed to me that the great heart of De Haerne had a share in the evolution of his scheme of education; while by intellectual processes he would if possible endow his pupils with speech, he would not at the same time proscribe a means of intercourse that admitted him to their sympathies. Several of the girls, in the hour which followed, read orally exercises written upon the blackboard, I endeavoring to gain some notion of their proficiency by reading their lips. The Sisters took the same pains to correct pronunciation as if I had been a hearing critic. My real intercourse with the pupils, however, was by writing and in French. While their oral attainments may be excellent, their progress in other studies has not apparently been equal to that of pupils of the same age in our own schools. This might be so, even in the absence of other causes, from the fact that their lives are more secluded, their movements less free, and therefore their experiences less wide than those of our own pupils.

From the school-rooms we entered a large court-yard, covered upon one side, where elaborate preparations had been planned for the ceremony, the more formal part of which of course had now to be omitted. The following address which I had prepared was, however, read to the school, in French:

MONSEIGNEUR: I have the honor to deliver to you this diploma, which certifies the fact that the College for the Deaf in America has conferred upon you the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters.

Upon this parchment you may read the signatures of the President of the United States and of the president and secretary of the college. Be assured, Monseigneur, that these honored men speak not only for themselves, but for many others in our land who have learned to appreciate your services and to venerate your character. We see in you the De l'Épée of our day; but, more fortunate than he in the means of communication, your liberal and energetic spirit has not been content to spend itself upon your own people—it has leaped over an arm of the sea and planted a new center of education in the islands of Britain; almost may we say that it has crossed the great ocean and seated itself within the borders of our own beloved America—for the contemplation of your example has been and is to us a guide and an inspiration.

Accept, then, Monseigneur, this evidence of our love and respect, and with it the hope that you may yet be spared to enjoy upon earth many years of health, happiness and honor.

In the absence of Monseigneur De Haerne the pupils made reply to the above, in French, of which the following is a translation :

SIR: Welcome to Belgium, and to this house. We welcome you as one of those generous men who consecrate their lives to the work of ameliorating the condition of the deaf and dumb. This title alone makes you at home among us. Besides which you are here to confer a marked distinction on Monseigneur de Haerne, our former director, our benefactor and father.

In the name, then, of all the deaf-mutes in Belgium we thank you most cordially for this testimony of respect and sympathy, brought from so great a distance to him who treads so faithfully in the steps of the Abbe de l'Épée.

We beg you, sir, to convey our grateful thanks to the president, Mr. Gallaudet, and to his colleagues of the College at Washington. Will you also express to your pupils, with whom we are already associated by a common misfortune, how happy we are to have our names linked henceforward with theirs in the expression of a common gratitude?

This address was written upon a blackboard, and at my request some of the pupils read it orally while others repeated it in signs that differed scarcely at all from our own.

These addresses, with others, formed part of a programme that had been arranged for the occasion; it opened with a rendition of "La Brabançonne," the Belgian national air, by the blind pupils, and closed with "Hail Columbia." One of the souvenirs given me was a copy of this programme, illuminated upon ivory by the Sister Raymunde, and truly an exquisite work of art.

While all the appointments of this institution are severely simple and inexpensive, it would be hard to find one where more attention is paid to the real essentials of air, light, cleanliness, and school-room appliances. More than this must be said: Never have I seen a body of instructors more devoted and patient than these appeared to be. Outside this, the delicacy, the refinement, the intelligence, and the kindness of the *Mère Begga*, the *Sœur Senensis*, and many others of the sweet-faced sisterhood, made impressions that never will be effaced.

Having thus discharged the duties intrusted to me, I turned my face homeward, confident in the belief that in the education of the deaf the Old World has little to teach the New, and happy in the consciousness that while much was good, great, and glorious in the kingdoms of Europe, yet no people have such cause for happiness as those whose lot is cast in the free, generous, and enlightened Republic of the United States.

AMOS G. DRAPER.

WASHINGTON, *October 1, 1889.*

